

Maryna Navalna<sup>1</sup>, Nataliia Kostusiak<sup>2</sup>, Oleksandr Mezhov<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine

<sup>2</sup>Lesya Ukrainka Volyn National University, Lutsk, Ukraine

m.navalna@phdpu.edu.ua, {kostusyak.nataliia, mezhov.oleksandr}@eenu.edu.ua

# The Functional-Cognitive Characteristics of Interrogative Utterances in Modern Ukrainian

## Abstract

The article presents a comprehensive multifaceted description of interrogative sentences in terms of the interaction of their semantic-syntactic (syntaxeme) and formal-grammatical articulation with their communicative articulation (relevant). The syntaxeme structure of interrogative sentences is determined according to the communicative intentions of the speaker. In particular, the following substantial syntaxemes, which serve as a means of modelling questions, are outlined: 1) the indefinite-interrogative subject of an action (physical, locative, intellectual, verbal); 2) the indefinite-interrogative subject of a state (physical, psycho-emotional, intellectual, locative, emotional-evaluative attitude, possessive); 3) the indefinite-interrogative subject of qualification feature, identification; 4) the indefinite-interrogative subject of a qualitative feature; 5) the indefinite-interrogative subject of a process; 6) the indefinite-interrogative object of an action (physical, intellectual-mental, verbal, perceptual); 7) the indefinite-interrogative object of a state (desire, intellectual); 8) the indefinite-interrogative object of a process (physical, psycho-emotional); 9) the indefinite-interrogative object of a qualitative feature; 10) the indefinite-interrogative addressee of an action or state; 11) the indefinite-interrogative means or instrument of an action; 12) the indefinite-interrogative locative.

All of these syntaxemes replace the positions of controlled subordinate parts in the formal-syntactic structure of a simple sentence. The emphasis is placed on interrogative words in the field of adverbial syntaxemes, in particular time, reasons, purposes, conditions, manner, and sources of information, which at the formal-syntactic level remain in the position of determinants — subordinate parts of the sentence. The specifics of the thematic-rhematic articulation of interrogative utterances and their communicative variants are examined. It is found that the communicative intention of the speaker's request determines the intonation type of the question (full dictal, partial dictal, full modal, partial modal), and the syntaxeme and formal structure of the interrogative sentence. The communicative intention also determines the semantic, morphological and positional variants of the interrogative marker. It is observed that interrogative words are usually positioned at the beginning of the sentence and form the rheme of the sentence.

**Keywords:** interrogative utterance; illocution; modality; semantic-syntactic structure of sentence; formal-syntactic structure of sentence; thematic-rhematic articulation, theme; rheme

## 1 Introduction

Among all the communicative types of utterances, a special role in the language system is assigned to interrogative constructions, which verbalize one of the most important illocutionary tasks of a speaker — the intention of request. Corresponding speech acts must include, in addition to the speaker, the addressee of speech to whom the request is addressed. Through questions, the

speaker tries to obtain the information they need by encouraging the interlocutor to answer. Such characteristics of interrogative sentences to some extent bring them closer to imperative sentences, which express the will of the speaker. In addition, the illocution of interrogation contains the desired modality, the desire of the speaker to learn something or to fill information gaps in their competencies. Interrogative utterances, as well as imperative and narrative utterances, are the objects of study of communicative speech syntax, which first of all aims to establish the peculiarities of their intonation and semantic-syntactic articulation in a particular speech situation. However, any utterance, in addition to its communicative organization, has a semantic-syntactic and formal-grammatical structure in the language system. A multifaceted approach to the analysis of syntactic units and categories, based on the interaction of three main aspects — formal-syntactic, semantic-syntactic and communicative — dominates the modern linguistic paradigm. In Ukrainian linguistics, different constructions (fragmentary and interrogative) have been studied by I. R. Vykhovanets (Vykhovanets', 1993), K. H. Horodenska (Horodenska', 1991), P. S. Dudyk (Dudyk, 1999), M. Ya. Pliushch (Pliushch, 2016), A. P. Zahnitko (Zahnitko, 2001), M. V. Mirchenko (Mirchenko, 2004), M. O. Vintoniv (Vintoniv, 2013), N. M. Kostusiak (Kostusiak, 2012), O. H. Mezhov (Mezhov, 2012), and others. In Ukrainian grammar, the first systematic description of sentences of direct (clarifying) and indirect interrogation, which forms the basis of textbooks on Ukrainian syntax, was proposed by L. O. Kadomtseva (Kadomtseva, 1972, pp. 128–133). In recent times, the studies of S. T. Shabat-Savky (Shabat, 2000, 2001; Shabat-Savka, 2016, 2019) have been devoted to relevant issues of content, markers of the actualization of intentions of request, and the communicative-pragmatic and derivational potential of interrogative utterances. Noteworthy are the review articles by M. V. Pankova on the evolution of linguistic views on the semantic and communicative structure of interrogative sentences, and the features of their thematic-rhematic articulation (Pankova, 2009, 2013). The problems raised by previous research require in-depth study. Particular attention should be paid to the balance between the formal, semantic and communicative organization of interrogative sentences in modern Ukrainian. It is important to study the semantic-syntactic potential of words that are directly involved in the formation of interrogative content. Pronouns and adverbs are dominant among such lexical items yet have been analysed the least in comparison with other parts of speech. Most recent studies have analysed the semantic potential of adjectives (Dimitrova & Stefanova, 2018), verbs and nouns (Dziob & Piasecki, 2018; Kostusiak, 2012; Mezhov, 2012; Mirchenko, 2004; Zahnitko, 2001).

New source bases should be used for research, in particular mass media texts as they best reflect language dynamics. It is important to study how some interrogative sentences, formed by journalists, implement the communicative-pragmatic function. It is also important to identify the dominant formal means of expressing different intentions of request and to characterize them in terms of cognitive load and the thematic-rhematic articulation of utterances.

The **purpose** of the article is therefore to present a comprehensive multifaceted description of interrogative sentences in terms of the interaction of their semantic-syntactic (syntaxeme) and formal-grammatical articulation with their communicative articulation (relevant). Achieving this goal involves the following main **tasks**: 1) to establish the syntaxeme structure of interrogative sentences in accordance with the communicative intentions of the speaker; 2) to study the specifics of the thematic-rhematic articulation of interrogative utterances and to identify their communicative variants; 3) to characterize the formal means of expressing interrogative modality in different types of utterances.

## 2 Typical Expressions of Request Intentions

The communicative-pragmatic goal of typical interrogative utterances is to obtain new information, to complete partial information, or to confirm the credibility of information in the form of a clear, specific answer from the addressee, which satisfies the speaker. If the interlocutors are unable to answer due to a lack of knowledge, do not want to answer, ask counter questions,

or knowingly provide false information, etc., the communication act must be considered to have been unsuccessful. S. T. Shabat-Savka states: “The linguistic form of expression of the category of interrogation represents a qualitative characteristic of the information gap in the knowledge of the subjects of communication — their desire to specify or clarify information, confirm or deny a fact of reality...” (Shabat-Savka, 2016, p. 105). This interpretation of the researcher served as the basis for distinguishing, following L. O. Kadomtseva (Kadomtseva, 1972, pp. 128–133), two typical expressions of intentions of request — specifying and clarifying (Shabat-Savka, 2016, p. 105).

R. Vykhovanets divides interrogative sentences according to the type of question and the expected answer into general interrogative (usually clarifying) and partial interrogative (specifying). Vykhovanets notes: “General questions are focused on either the affirmative answer (*Yes*), or the negative answer (*No*), or other modifications of these answers. Partial interrogative sentences are aimed at obtaining some new partial information” (Vykhovanets, 1993, p. 146).

### 3 Peculiarities of the Syntaxeme Structure of Partial Interrogative Sentences

The semantic-syntactic structure of partial interrogative sentences is determined by the nature of the information that the speaker seeks to obtain: information about the performer of the action or the bearer of the process, a state, qualitative and quantitative features; the person (other being) or object to whom/which an action, process, state is directed; the person to whom an action is addressed; the instrument or means of transportation; the location of a person (another being), the location of an object, the direction and mode of movement; the circumstances under which (or contrary to which) certain actions took place, or processes, states (time, cause, condition, etc.) took place; about an event, process or state.

In order to clarify the required partial information, the following syntaxemes are used:

1. the pronominal noun *who?*, specialized in the explication of questions about beings. It also appears in various non-prepositional (*koho?* [who?], *komu?* [whom?], *kym?* [who?]) and prepositional *do* (*pro*, *dlia*, *bilja*) *koho?* [to (about, for, near) whom?], *nakoho?* [on whom?], *na* (*pry*, *u*) *komu?* [on (at, in) whom?] forms;
2. the pronominal noun *shcho?* [what?], which participates in the verbalization of questions about non-existent objects in various non-prepositional (*choho?* [what?], *chym?* [what?]) and prepositional *do* (*bilja*) *choho?* [to (near) what?], *na* (*pro*) *shcho?* [on (about) what?], *na* (*pry*, *u*) *chomu?* [on (near, in) what?] forms. These forms are used to determine the action or condition of a person (*Shcho z nym dietsia?* [What is happening to him?]), as well as the reasons (*chomu?* [why?], *za shcho?* [for what?]), object or purpose of the subject (*dlia* (*zadlia*, *zarady*) *choho?* [for (for, for the sake of) what?]) in the case of adverbialization — the transition from the sphere of subjectification to the adverb;
3. the pronominal adjectives *yakyi?* [which?], *kotryi?* [which?], *chy?* [whose?], which model questions about the properties and the qualitative and possessive features of beings and non-beings, their order by numbers (list), and their order by time time;
4. the pronominal numeral *skilky?* [how many?], which is the only representative of questions about the number of subjects;
5. the pronominal adverbs *de?* [where?], *kudy?* [where?], *zvidky?* [where?], *koly?* [when?], *vidkoly?* [since when?], *doky?* [while?], *poky?* [until?], *chomu?* [why?], *navishcho?* [why?], *nashcho?* [why?], *yak?* [how?], *naskilky?* [to what extent?], etc., assigned to questions about place, time, reason, purpose, manner, and the degree of expression or intensity of manner;
6. derivatives of the prepositional case and other compounds with similar intentions of request: *za yakoi umovy?* [under what conditions?], *z yakoiu metoiu?* [for what purpose?], *popry shcho?* [despite what?], *usuperech* (*naperekir*) *chomu?* [despite what?], *nezvazhaiuchy na shcho?* [no matter what?], *z yakoi prychny?* [for what reason?], *z yakoho chasu?* [since when?], *do yakoho*

*chasu?* [for how long?], *z yakykh pir?* [since when?], *do yakykh pir?* [until when?], *u yakomu napriamku?* [in what direction?], *yakym shliakhom?* [in what way?], *u yakyi bik?* [in which direction?], *u yaku mistse?* [in what place?], *z yakoho mistsia?* [from what place?], *yakym sposobom?* [in what way?], *yakoiu miroiu?* [to what extent?], *do yakoi miry?* [to what extent?], *do yakoho stupenia?* [to what level?], *yak chasto?* [how often?], *yak bahato?* [how many?], *skilky raziv?* [how many times?], *u skilky raziv?* [how many times?], *u naslidok choho?* [as a result of what?], *zavdiaky chomu?* [thanks to what?], *za yakykh obstavyn?* [under what circumstances?], *u yakomu vypadku?* [in which case?], *zarady choho?* [for what?], *pro koho (shcho) ydetsia* [who (what) are you talking about?].

All of these interrogative forms refer to unknown, unclear, or unspecified (for the speaker) objects, features, and circumstances, which the speaker intends to learn from the interlocutor by structuring interrogative sentences and waiting for specific answers.

The main feature of the semantic-syntactic organization of partial interrogative sentences is that interrogative words or phrases are usually located at the beginning of the construction, regardless of their syntactic function or mode of expression. The representatives of semantic-syntactic functions in a simple sentence are syntaxemes distinguished on the basis of semantic relations — minimal syntactic units of semantic variety, which reflect the relationship between objects and phenomena of the extralinguistic world (Vykhovanets', 1993, p. 245).

To mark unknown persons, other beings, objects and phenomena in accordance with the illocutionary purpose, the speaker uses interrogative pronominal nouns and other means in the semantic-syntactic positions of the following substantial syntaxemes due to the valence of the basic predicate:

1. the indefinite-interrogative subject of an action; in addition to the functional characteristics defined by researchers (subjective function, nearside to the predicate position, activity, correlation with the formal-syntactic position of the subject (Kostusiak, 2012, pp. 74–100; Mezhov, 2012, pp. 125–145; Vykhovanets', 1993, pp. 258–260), the analysed language units show a certain originality. The following indefinite-interrogative syntaxemes function as subjects of the following actions:
  - a) physical; in the case of subordination to verbs, the lexical content of which is associated with the marking of someone's dynamic activity: *Khto zbuduie dorohu v Yevropu?* [Who is going to build the road to Europe?] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 28.05.2015); *Khto zrobyv iz pamiatky arkhitekturue opudalo ta chy mozhlyvo yii vriatuvaty?* [Who turned architectural monument into scarecrow and is there a way to save it?] (<https://vitatv.com.ua>, 26.11.2020); *Khto striliaie naikrashche?* [Who shoots the best?] (<https://ibis.net.ua>, 19.06.2019); *Khto vbyv Pavla Sheremeta?* [Who killed Pavlo Sheremet?] (<https://www.dw.com>, 04.09.2020); *Khto I koly znyshchyy u Rosii demokratiu?* [Who and when destroyed democracy in Russia?] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 11.10.2018);
  - b) locative; in the structures of this variety, in addition to the subject with indefinite-interrogative semantics, there are predicate-dependent right-side syntaxemes with the meaning of place: *Khto poide zi mnoiu na krai svitu?* [Who will go with me to the ends of the earth?] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 26.09.2012); *Khto pide slidom?* [Who will follow?] (<https://tyzhden.ua>, 18.08.2020);
  - c) intellectual; usually in such sentences the indefinite-interrogative subject enters the valence frame of divalent verbs, which show their meaning also with the help of the obligatory right-side component mainly in the abstract meaning: *Khto vyhadav nazvu?* [Who came up with the name?] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 08.06.2011); *Khto prydumav termin "detektyv", i khto vpershe sformuluuvav pryntsyipy anhliiskoho klasy chnoho detektyvu?* [Who invented the term "detective", and who first introduced the principles of the English classic detective?] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 03.01.2017); *Khto napysav muzyku v try roky?* [Who wrote music in three years old?] (<http://www.golos.com.ua>, 01.09.2011);

- d) verbal; when the prop predicate explicates a dynamically designed speech feature: *I khto kazav, shcho Usyk bezudarnyi?* [And who said that Usyk is unbeaten?] (<https://www.volyn.com.ua>, 25.12.2020); *To yak azh real vartisthazu v Ukraini? Khto vidpovist na tse zapytannia?* [So what is the real cost of Ukrainian gas? Who will answer this question?] (<https://dilovyi.info>, 09.05.2019);
2. the indefinite-interrogative subject of a state, characterized by the presence of indefinite-interrogative passivity as a temporary characteristic of a person. The syntaxeme of the analysed example is realized by interrogative pronominal nouns in different case and prepositional-case forms, denoting the carrier of the following types of class feature:
- a) physical; associated with the expression of changes in the human body, the expression of physiological discomfort, stress, etc. or, on the other hand, signs of a positive nature: *Finansy oblasti zablokovani: khto strazhdaie?* [The region's finances are blocked: who is suffering?] (<http://nova.te.ua>, 11.09.2020); *Khto naibilshe strazhdaie v Rosii vid padinnia rublia?* [Who is suffering the most in Russia from the ruble's fall?] (<https://news.24tv.ua>, 23.12.2014);
  - b) psycho-emotional; the presence of which is not caused by the subject. Usually the formation of its psycho-emotional state is influenced by certain objective factors or other persons: *Bo komu ... ne bulo liachno?* [Because who ... wasn't scared?] (<https://prostir.museum>, 14.04.2017);
  - c) intellectual; explaining the mental capacity of an unknown person: *Khto znaie istoriiu Kyieva?* [Who knows the history of Kyiv?] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 27.05.2008);
  - d) locative; the formation of which is directly influenced by the locative predicates *to be*, *to remain*, *to happen*, *to live*, etc., which may have an explicit expression: *Komu zhyvetsia veselo, pryvylno v Ukraini?* [Who lives happily, freely in Ukraine?] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 11.12.2009); *Khto tut?* [Who is here?] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 20.03.2018);
  - e) emotional and evaluative attitude; the following indefinite-interrogative subjective syntaxemes subordinated with predicates which express a positive or negative attitude towards someone or something, an inner state, feelings, or an interest: *Komu tse mozhe buty tsikavo?* [Who would be interested?] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 22.07.2013); *Koho b ne zatsikavyla taka propozyitsia?* [Who wouldn't be interested in such an offer?] (<http://vilne.org.ua>, 12.07.2016);
  - f) possessive; discovered due to belonging to an unknown person: *U koho kliuchi vid "zernovoho raiu"?* [Who has the keys to the "grain paradise"?] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 16.10.2008);
3. the indefinite-interrogative subject of qualification features or identification, which indicates the absence of specific information about the being. Because of this, the speaker tries to discover its characteristics, peculiarities, features, etc., encouraging the addressee to specify certain information: *Khto takyi Rei Voshbern?* [Who is Ray Washburn?] (<https://ukrainian.voanews.com>, 27.08.2017); *Kym buv Vasyl Stus?* [Who was Vasyl Stus?] (<https://www.radiosvoboda.org>, 06.01.2018); *Ale khto vin, toi Ivan Maksymovych Soshenko, dobryi Tarasiv anhel?* [But who is he, that Ivan Maksymovyc Soshenko, a good angel of Taras?] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 18.03.2006);
4. the indefinite-interrogative subject of a qualitative feature, in particular a qualitative, variable, which by comparison reveals a partial advantage or excessive expression, as well as an ordinal one: *Khto vynen u povenevii katastrofi na Prykarpatti?* [Who is to blame for the flood catastrophe in Prykarpattia?] (<https://vda.org.ua>, 25.06.2020); *Khto naikrashchyi? Iz 19 po 21 bereznia u Kyievi vidbudetsia IV Mizhnarodnyi yunatskyi konkurs-festyval klasychnoho tantsiu "HRAN-PRI KYIV"* [Who is the best? From March 19 to 21, the IV International Youth Competition Festival of Classical Dance "GRAND PRIX OF KYIV" will take place in Kyiv] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 15.03.2018); *Komu potribna knyzhka v Ukraini?* [Who needs a book in Ukraine?] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 28.04.2017); *Khto pershyi u kvesti?* [Who is the first in

- the quest?] (<http://mradapology.gov.ua>, 21.10.2020); *Khto pershyi u cherzi na vaktsynatsiiu vid koronavirusu?* [Who is first in line for coronavirus vaccination?] (<https://itvmg.com>, 07.12.2020);
5. the indefinite-interrogative subject of a process, in particular the procedural phenomena of flora and the physiological processes of beings or personified objects: *Shcho tsvite u lvivskomu botanichnomu sadu?* [What blooms in the Lviv Botanical Garden?] (<http://tvoemisto.tv>, 25.04.2020); *Shcho roste v lisakh?* [What grows in forests?] (<https://upravles.gov.ua>, 15.06.2011); *Khto khvorii na koronavirus?* [Who is getting sick from coronavirus?] (<http://www.auc.org.ua>, 16.03.2020);
  6. the indefinite-interrogative object of an action, the semantic ranking of which is related to the semantic nature of the prop predicate, given that the right-side syntaxemes of this type explicate the objects of such actions:
    - a) physical: *Shcho zrobyly u 2019 rotsi u shkolakh Menskoi OTH?* [What was done in 2019 in the schools of Minsk JTT?] (<http://mena.org.ua>, 14.01.2020); *Richnytsia 9/11: shcho zbuduvaly namistsivezh-blyzniukiv?* [9/11 Anniversary: what is rebuilt on the site of the Twin Towers?] (<https://www.bbc.com>, 11.09.2018); *Komu prysluzhuie verkhivka kyivskoi filii "stalinskoho patriarkhatu"?* [Whom do the leaders of Kyiv branch of "Stalin patriarchy" show favor to?] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 12.05.2015);
    - b) intellectual and mental, related to mental activity: *Shcho ukraintsi dumaiut pro Konstytutsiinyi Sud?* [What do Ukrainians think about the Constitutional Court?] (<https://dif.org.ua>, 21.12.2020); *Kohoo braty? Znaiomymo z deiakymy nominantamy na prestyzhnu mystetsku premiiu* [Whom to choose? Introducing with some nominees for the prestigious art award] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 10.02.2007);
    - c) verbal, related to speech: *Iryna Hrymak u Drohobychi. Pro shcho hovoryly?* [Iryna Hrymak in Drohobych. What were they talking about?] (<https://drohobych-rada.gov.ua>, 23.12.2020); *Pro shcho prosiat Prezydenta v yoho hromadskykh pryimalniakh?* [What is the President asked for in his public receptions?] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 14.07.2005);
    - d) receptive: *I zreshtoi, shcho same y koho pobachat hliadachi "5 kanalu" protiahom 23–24 serpnia navashomu kanali?* [And in the end, what and who exactly will the viewers of "Channel 5" see on August 23–24 on your channel?] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 19.08.2011);
  7. the indefinite-interrogative object of a state, in particular:
    - a) desire; the semantic nature of such substantial syntaxemes is influenced by prop verbs such as *bazhaty* [to wish], *volity* [to wish], *zhadaty* [to wish], *mruiaty* [to wish], *prahnuty* [to want], *khotity* [to want]: *Choho khochut? Ukrasty v ostanni tyzhni pered obranniam prezidenta?* [What do they want? Steal in the last weeks before the election of the president?] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 15.05.2014); *Ot zhe, choho khoche molod?* [So, what do young people want?] (<https://mbr.com.ua>, 24.11.2020); — *Choho prahnut sohodni katolytski osvichni zaklady y, zokrema, vash universytet?* [— What do Catholic educational institutions and, in particular, your university wish for?] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 07.11.2009);
    - b) intellectual; associated with the realization of mental dynamic features: *Komu viryty?* [Who to trust?] (<http://www.golos.com.ua>, 08.07.2020); *Komu poviryt Yevropa?* [Whom will Europe believe?] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 17.01.2009); *Pro shcho dumaiie Donbas?* [What is Donbass thinking about?] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 26.04.2018); *Koho shanuiesh, Ukraino?* [Who do you respect, Ukraine?] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 15.08.2019);
  8. the indefinite-interrogative object of a process (physical or psycho-emotional): *Nad chym, vlasne, smialysia?* [What, exactly, were they laughing at?] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 22.11.2000);
  9. the indefinite-interrogative object of a qualitative feature, the functional features of which make it possible to identify predicatively used adjectives: *Choho vartyi retsept baraniachoi nohy, farshyrovanoi ustrytsiamy?* [What is the recipe for lamb leg stuffed with oysters worth



- for?] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 17.12.2020); *Na shcho zdatna odna liudyna?* [What is one person capable of?] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 23.01.2015);
10. the indefinite-interrogative addressee of an action or state. It is important to emphasize that in narrative constructions the addressee component correlates with the semi-strongly controlled subordinate part of the sentence. In interrogative constructions, on the other hand, its connection with the predicate is greatly enhanced. The speaker seeks to obtain information from an unknown person as the addressee: *Komu skazaty "diakuiu" za te, shcho zhyvyi?* [To whom can I say "thank you" for being alive?] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 06.08.1997);
  11. the indefinite-interrogative instrument or means of an action: *Chym zakhyschchajemo vrozhaai shcho yimo?* [How do we protect the harvest and what do we eat?] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 18.03.2019); *Chym doidut u didzhitalizovane maibutnie ukrainski sela?* [How will Ukrainian villages reach the digitalized future?] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 24.09.2019);
  12. the indefinite-interrogative locative. The valence of locative predicates in interrogative constructions involves the interrogative markers *de?* [where?], *zvidky?* [where?], *kudy?* [where?], *yakym shliakhom?* [in what way?] in the semantic-syntactic positions of locative syntaxemes of place, direction of movement (starting point and final destination), and way of movement: *De zh toi "rai", za yakyi borolysia?* [Where is that "paradise" for which they fought?] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 11.09.2020); *De pochynaetsia Yevropa?* [Where does Europe begin?] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 22.12.2014); *Koly, zvidky y komu distanetsia vaktsyna?* [When, where and who will get the vaccine?] (<https://zz.te.ua>, 24.12.2020); *Kudy plyve I kudy plystyme Ukraina?* [Where is Ukraine drifting now and where will it get?] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 15.01.2020).

All of the previously characterized substantial syntaxemes replace the positions of the controlled subordinate parts in the formal-syntactic structure of a simple sentence due to the valence of basic predicates.

Interrogative pronominal adverbs and syntactic combinations in the semantic-syntactic positions of adverbial syntaxemes allow the speaker to discover unknown circumstances of events:

1. time: *De I koly pomyluvatysia tsvitom vesnoiu 2019?* [Where and when to admire the blossom in spring of 2019?] (<https://eventukraine.com>, 01.04.2019); *Doky tryvatyme karantyn?* [How long will the quarantine last?] (<http://m-studio.net.ua>, 25.06.2020);
2. reason: *Chomu liudy na tse zdatni?* [Why are people capable of this?] (<https://www.bbc.com>, 08.11.2020); *Chomu khochut zakryty "Kryivku"?* [Why do they want to close Kryivka?] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 07.12.2012)
3. purpose: *Navishcho vytrachaty hroshi na areshtovane maino?* [Why spend money on seized property?] (<https://www.epravda.com.ua>, 18.12.2020); *Chym i dlia choho pidhodovuvaty ptakhiv vzymku?* [What and why to feed birds in winter?] (<http://epl.org.ua>, 17.12.2018);
4. condition: *Za yakikh obstavyn matyme perspektyvy utopiia "suverennoho Krymu"?* [Under what circumstances will the utopia of the "sovereign Crimea" have prospects?] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 29.01.2020); *Za yakikh umov bude oholosheno lokdaun?* [Under what conditions will the lockdown be announced?] ([www.segodnya.ua](http://www.segodnya.ua), 28.11.2020);
5. manner: *Yak prokhodyt rozsliduvannia sprav pro porushennia prav liudyny v aneksovanomu Krymu?* [How is the investigation of human rights violations in the annexed Crimea?] (<https://ua.krymr.com>, 12.05.2017); *Yak narodylasia pisnia "Ridna maty moia"?* [How was the song "My Dearest Mother" born?] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 17.05.2017); *Chy vidbuvalysia tadi vybory i u yakyi sposib?* [Did the elections take place then and in what way?] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 04.07.2008);
6. sources of information: *Pro sohodnishniu zustrich zvidky diznalsia?* [How did you find out about today's meeting?] (<https://pl.suspilne.media>, 23.03.2019).

The pronominal adjectives *yakyi?* [what?], *kotryi?* [which?], *chyi?* [whose?] and the pronominal numeral *skilky?* [how many?] in the semantic-syntactic function of preposed predicate syntaxemes

make it possible to verbalize questions about the qualitative and possessive features of beings and non-beings, their order in a list, their quantitative characteristics, and their chronological order: *Yaka kontseptsiiia festyvaliu?* [What is the concept of the festival?] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 08.06.2011); *Chyi zhe naspravdi Krym?* [Whose Crimea is anyway?] (<https://news.24tv.ua>, 23.12.2014); *Mists peredbachaietsia skilky?* [How many seats are expected?] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 08.06.2011). In the corresponding communicative task, these interrogative words are able to move to the postposition: *Kontseptsiiia festyvaliu ye yaka?* [in English translation the word order remains the same: What is the concept of the festival?] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 08.06.2011); *Naspravdi zh Krym chyi?* [in English translation the word order remains the same: Whose Crimea is anyway?] (<https://news.24tv.ua>, 23.12.2014); *Mists peredbachaietsia skilky?* [in English translation the word order remains the same: How many seats are expected?]. The answers to the corresponding questions, depending on the communicative purpose of the message and the need to focus on a particular feature, can be complete or incomplete nominative one-member sentences or compound constructions: *Tsikava kontseptsiiia festyvaliu* [Interesting concept of the festival]; *Tsikava* [Interesting]; *Kontseptsiiia festyvaliu tsikava* [The concept of the festival is interesting]; *Ukrainskyi Krym* [Ukrainian Crimea]; *Ukrainskyi* [Ukrainian]; *Krym ukrainskyi* [Crimea is Ukrainian]; *Piat mists* [Five seats]; *Piat* [Five]; *Mists peredbachaietsia piat* [Five places are expected].

At the formal-syntactic level of the sentence, the syntaxemes of time, reason, purpose, condition, manner, and sources of information are in the position of determinants — subordinate members.

#### 4 The Thematic-Rhematic Articulation of Partial Interrogative Utterances

The thematic-rhematic articulation of partial interrogative utterances is peculiar, and is closely related to the semantic-syntactic articulation. If in narrative utterances the theme usually precedes the rheme, then in partial interrogative utterances the theme follows the rheme. This means that in the thematic-rhematic articulation of partial interrogative utterances, any interrogative markers fall into the communicative position of the rheme: substantive, adverbial and predicate syntaxemes, expressed by pronominal words (nouns, adjectives, numerals and adverbs) or other units that “form the semantic centre of interrogative utterances, reflect the intentional horizons of the speaker...” (Shabat-Savka, 2019, p. 266).

For the subjective syntaxemes of narrative sentences, the typical initial position is the theme, whereas the typical position for the predicate is the rheme. The utterance *Instytut sadivnytstva* (theme) / *zbuduie viru solohichnyi kompleks* (rheme) [Institute of Horticulture (theme) / will build a virological complex (rheme)] (<https://agro.24tv.ua>, 26.12.2020) is the answer to the general question *Shcho zbuduie Instytut sadivnytstva?* [What will the Horticultural Institute build?] (rheme), aimed at clarifying relevant information in general related to the activities of the Horticultural Institute. The answer to the question *Khto* (rheme) / *zbuduie virusolohichnyi kompleks* (theme)? [Who (rheme) / will build a virological complex (theme)?] shows the utterance *Virusolohichnyi kompleks zbuduie* (theme) / *Instytut sadivnytstva* (rheme) [A virological complex will be built (theme) / by Institute of Horticulture (rheme)], in which the informationally significant subjective syntaxeme indicating the performer of the action is moved to the atypical position of the rheme. In expressively coloured oral speech, due to the logical emphasis on the syntaxeme-speaker and the change of word order, the rheme may appear at the beginning of the utterance, according to V. Matezius's concept of subjective word order (Matezius, 1967, p. 244): *Instytut sadivnytstva* (rheme) / *zbuduie virusolohichnyi kompleks* (theme) [The Institute of Horticulture (rheme) / will build a virological complex (theme)]. The speakers can also direct their question to clarify the information which is important to them at a certain moment — the object of an action, that is the subject to which an action is directed, namely: *Shcho* (rheme) / *zbuduie Instytut sadivnytstva* (theme)? [What (rheme) / will the Institute of Horticulture build (theme)?]. In



the answer of the interlocutor *Instytut sadivnytstva zbuduie* (theme) / *virusolohichnyi kompleks* (rheme) [Institute of Horticulture will build (theme) / a virological complex (rheme)] the logical emphasis will, according to the communicative task, move to the object syntaxeme. An additional means of expressing the object-rheme can be the limiting-intensifying particle *tilky* [only]: *Instytut sadivnytstva zbuduie* (theme) / *tilky virusolohichnyi kompleks* (rheme) [Institute of Horticulture will build (theme) / only a virological complex (rheme)].

The utterance *Ukraina daruie Makedonii* (theme) / *druzhbu* (rheme) [Ukraine pledges friendship (rheme) / to Macedonia (theme)] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 07.07.2001) emphasizes the object action in the final position, answering the question *Shcho* (rheme) / *daruie Ukraina Makedonii* (theme)? [What (rheme) / does Ukraine pledge to Macedonia (theme)?], in which the objective syntaxeme, explicated by the possessive case of the pronominal noun, stands at the beginning. In the constructions of the analysed type, the so-called “addressee” verbs predict by their valence the obligatory addressee syntaxeme in the dative case, actualized in the communicative position of the complex rheme due to the speaker’s interrogative utterance. Compare: *Komu* (rheme) / *daruie Ukraina druzhbu* (theme)? [To whom (rheme) / Ukraine pledges friendship (theme)?] And *Ukraina daruie druzhbu* (theme) / *Makedonii* (rheme) [Ukraine pledges friendship (theme) / to Macedonia (rheme)].

If speakers want to learn about an instrument or a means of transportation, they use the interrogative pronouns *chym?* [what?], *na chomu?* [what?] in the position of a rheme as morphological variants of instrumental syntaxemes. For example, the utterance *...ukrainski deputaty yizdiat na liuksovykh avto...* [...ukrainian deputies drive luxury cars...] (<https://tsn.ua>, 17.03.2018) will be an answer to the question *Na chomu* (rheme) / *yizdiat ukrainski deputaty* (theme) [What (rheme) / cars do Ukrainian deputies drive (theme)], aimed at expanding the speaker’s knowledge with new information about the means of transportation. In the answer, the connection *na liuksovykh avto* [luxury cars] is in the final positions and in the nominative case.

The goal-oriented request of a speaker about the location of the subject or the direction or the way of its movement is conveyed by the pronominal adverbs-locatives *de?* [where?], *zvidky?* [where?], *kudy?* [where?], as well as the phrases *u yakom napriamku?* [in what direction?], *yakym shliakhom?* [which way?] in the rheme position of interrogative utterances. According to such communicative tasks, the relevant information of narrative sentences is in the final locative syntaxemes. Compare: *De* (rheme) / *sydyt liudyna* (theme)? [Where (rheme) / is a man sitting (theme)?] And *... liudyna sydyt* (theme) / *v okopi* (rheme)... [...a man sitting (theme) / in trenches (rheme)...] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 24.11.2017); *Zvidky* (rheme) / *vynosyly cherez try dni pislia Triitsi lepekhu y inshi travy* (theme)? [From where (rheme) / were calamus and other herbs taken out three days after the Trinity (theme)?] And *Cherez try dni pislia Triitsi lepekhu y inshi travy ... vynosyly* (theme) / *z khaty* (rheme) [Three days after the Trinity calamus and other herbs ... were taken out (theme) / from the house (rheme)] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 04.06.2020); *Kudy* (rheme) / *vyrushyly 35 spivrobitnyki v battalion u patrolnoi sluzhby politsii osoblyvoho pryznachennia* (theme) [Where (rheme) / did 35 officers of the battalion of special tasks patrol police go (theme)] and *35 spivrobitnyki v battalioni patrolnoi sluzhby politsii osoblyvoho pryznachennia vyrushyly* (theme) / *do Mariupolia* (rheme) [35 officers of the battalion of special tasks patrol police went (theme) / to Mariupol (rheme)] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 20.07.2020).

With the help of explanatory questions, a speaker can obtain important information not only about objects and phenomena of the surrounding world, but also about the circumstances of certain events, their time, causes, and conditions. A speaker may learn about the purpose of any activity or the factors against which the action takes place. In the following utterances — *Shotlandiia vymahaie nezalezhnosti vid Velykoi Brytanii* (theme) / *pislia Brexit* (rheme) [Scotland demands independence from Great Britain (theme) / after Brexit (rheme)] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 24.12.2020); *Publika obimlila* (theme) / *vid zdyvuvannia* (rheme) [Audience was blown away (theme) / by surprise (rheme)] (<https://showbiz.clutch.ua>, 17.06.2020); *Ukraina rozpochala perehovory z YeS* (theme) / *dlia otrymannia vaktsyny vid COVID-19* (rheme) [Ukraine has started negotiations with the EU (theme) / to receive a vaccine from COVID-19 (rheme)] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 20.07.2020).

[kyiv.ua](https://day.kyiv.ua), 21.12.2020) — clear answers are given, with communicatively significant circumstantial syntaxemes, to the following questions of the speaker — *Koly* (rheme) / *Shotlandiia vymahaie nezalezhnosti vid Velykoi Brytanii* (theme)? [*When* (rheme) / does Scotland demand independence from Great Britain (theme)?]; *Chomu* (rheme) / *publika obimlila* (theme)? [*Why* (rheme) / was the audience blown away (theme)?]; *Navishcho* (rheme) / *Ukraina rozpochala perehovory z YeS* (theme)? [*Why* (rheme) / has Ukraine started negotiations with the EU (theme)?] — in which the initial rheme position is replaced by syntaxemes of time, cause and purpose, expressed by relevant interrogative words. The conditional and concessive interrogative words display the same communicative-functional potential.

The predicate syntaxemes of quality and quantity become the communicative core of messages if the speaker seeks to find out *Skilky* (rheme) / *ye osib chy predmetiv* (theme)? [*How many* (rheme) / are there persons or objects? (theme)]; *Yakymy* (rheme) / *ye osoby chy predmety* (theme)? [*What* (rheme) / are persons or objects (theme)?]; *Komu* (rheme) / *nalezhat predmety* (theme)? [*Whom* (rheme) / do the objects belong to (theme)?], etc. The answers to such requests are given by informative statements of a formally simple or compound structure. Compare: *...napadnykiv* (theme) / *bulo dvoie* (rheme)... [*...there were two* (rheme) / attackers (theme)...] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 06.12.2019) and *Dvoie napadnykiv* (rheme) [*Two attackers* (rheme)]; *...viina* (theme) / *kryvava i pidstupna* (rheme)... [*...war* (theme) / bloody and insidious (rheme)...] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 15.07.2016) and *Kryvava y pidstupna viina* (rheme) [*Bloody and insidious war* (rheme)]; *...usi hazovi merezhi nalezhat* (theme) / *zamovnykam* (rheme) [*...all gas networks belong* (theme) / to customers (rheme)] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 04.03.2020).

In partial interrogative utterances, the most frequent means of expression of the thematic-rhematic articulation are: a phrasal stress, which falls on the interrogative pronominal component; subjective word order (the pronominal syntaxeme is in the initial position of the rheme); the amplifying particle *zhe* (*zh*) [but] in the interrogative word: *Khto zh* (rheme) / *naspravdi ye "dyvannyi stratehamy"* (theme)? [*But who* (rheme) / are actually "armchair generals" (theme)?] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 15.08.2014). The considered partial interrogative utterances, according to Balli's classification, express a partial dictal question, which reflects ignorance of a partial aspect of the event and is directed to a part of the information available in the utterances (Balli, 1955, pp. 47–48).

The accuracy or inaccuracy of information about a partial aspect of an event is revealed by partial modal questions with shades of doubt, mistrust, and surprise. One of the most important means of distinguishing the rheme in partial modal questions is the presence of the interrogative particles *chy?* [really?], *khiba?* [really?], *nevzhe?* [really?], which mostly appear at the beginning of a sentence in the communicative position of the rheme, together with the syntaxeme on which the clarifying question of the speaker is focused on, and which is accompanied by a special intonation stress with a logical emphasis. For example, the communicative paradigm of the sentence *... chy zmozhut ukraintsi vidpochyty za kordonom?* [in English translation interrogative particles are not at the beginning: *...will Ukrainians really be able to spend holidays abroad?..*] (<http://vycherpno.ck.ua>, 01.07.2020) covers at least three interrogative utterances — communicative variants, each of which the speaker tries in order to confirm the credibility of some partial aspect of the event, expressed by the following syntaxemes:

1. subjective: *... chy ukraintsi* (rheme) / *zmozhut vidpochyty za kordonom* (theme)? [*...will Ukrainians really* (rheme) / *be able to spend holidays abroad* (theme)?] — questions; *Zmozhut vidpochyty za kordonom* (theme) / *ukraintsi* (rheme) [*Ukrainians* (rheme) / *will be able to spend holidays abroad* (theme)] — answer;
2. predicate: *Chy zmozhut vidpochyty* (rheme) / *ukraintsi za kordonom* (theme)? [*Will Ukrainians* (theme) / *be able to spend holidays abroad* (rheme)?] — questions; *Ukraintsi za kordonom* (theme) / *zmozhut vidpochyty* (rheme) [*Ukrainians* (theme) / *will be able to spend holidays abroad* (rheme)] — answer;
3. locative: *Chy za kordonom* (rheme) / *ukraintsi zmozhut vidpochyty* (theme)? [*Will Ukrainians be able to spend holidays* (theme) / *abroad* (rheme)?] — question; *Ukraintsi zmozhut vid-*

*pochyty* (theme) / *za kordonom* (rheme) [Ukrainians will be able to spend holidays (theme) / abroad (rheme)] — the answer.

Thus, the number of possible communicative variants of a partial modal question is directly proportional to the number of syntaxemes within it.

The negative particle *ne* in substantial syntaxemes may be a marker of the amplification of a rheme in partial interrogative requests, in particular:

1. subjective: *Khiba ne suspilstvo* (rheme) / *vymahalo vidkrytykh spyskiv* (theme)? [Didn't the society (rheme) / demand open lists (theme)?] (<https://rai.ua>, 31.08.2020) — question; *Vymahalo vidkrytykh spyskiv* (theme) / *same suspilstvo* (rheme) [The open lists (theme) / were demanded by the society (rheme)] — answer;
2. objective: *Ale khiba ne pro tse* (rheme) / *my chuiemo vzhe 20 rokiv pospil* (theme)? [But isn't about this (rheme) / we've been hearing for 20 years in a row (theme)?] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 14.12.2011) — question; *My chuiemo vzhe 20 rokiv pospil* (theme) / *same pro tse* (rheme) [We have been hearing for 20 years in a row (theme) / about this (rheme)] — the answer;
3. locative: *Do rechi, khiba ne v Mezhyhiri* (rheme) / *...bula skhovana biblioteka Mudroho* (theme)? [By the way, wasn't it Mezhyhiria (rheme) / ...where the library of the Yaroslav the Wise was hidden (theme)?] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 13.01.2012) — question; *Biblioteka Mudroho bula skhovana* (theme) / *same v Mezhyhiri* (rheme) [Library of Yaroslav the Wise was hidden (theme) / in Mezhyhiria (rheme)] — answer;
4. instrumental: *Khiba ne tankamy* (rheme) / *vony zaikhaly tadi* (theme)? [Weren't there tanks (rheme) / they use (theme)?] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 17.09.2016) — question; *Vony zaikhaly tadi* (theme) / *same tankamy* (rheme) [They used (theme) / the tanks (rheme)] — the answer.

The particle *zhe* (*zh*) [but] enhances the significance of both substantive and secondary predicate (circumstantial) syntaxemes in the position of the rheme, in particular the subjective one: *Khiba zh Ukraina* (rheme) / — *vzhe bilshe ne khram* (theme)? [But is Ukraine (rheme) / no longer a temple (theme)?] (<http://svitlytsia.crimea.ua>, 22.06.2012); objective: *...khiba zh usikh i use* (rheme) / *zapamiataiesh* (theme)?.. [...but is it possible to remember (theme) / everyone and everything (rheme)?..] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 02.01.2014); temporal: *Khiba zh u skrutnu myt* (rheme) / *ne varto zrobyty vse dlia toho, shcho b povernuty svoikh spivvitchyznykiv dodomu, dopomohty yim za bud-yaku tsinu?!* (theme) [But in a difficult moment (rheme) / isn't it important to do everything to bring your compatriots home, to help them at any cost?! (theme)] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 20.02.2020), etc.

The limiting-intensifying participle *same* [really] determines the movement of the rheme into any communicative position — both at the beginning and at the end of the partial interrogative utterance. Compare: *Nevzhe same tut* (rheme) / *mistse dlia suchasnoho mystetstva* (theme)?.. [Is it really here (rheme) / the place for contemporary art (theme)?..] (<https://tsn.ua>, 05.06.2015); *Nevzhe same tut* (rheme) / *nabyraiut "chystu, pytnu vodu"* (theme)? [Is it really here (rheme) / they are getting "clean, drinking water" (theme)?] (<https://portal.lviv.ua>, 17.11.2008) and *Nevzhe Nevzhe Tkachenko zasluhnyv post Ministra kultury* (theme) / *same cherezy ii "vbyvstvo"* (rheme)? [Did Tkachenko really deserve the post of Minister of Culture (theme) / really because of her "murder" (rheme)?] (<https://wikibaza.com>, 03.06.2020).

## 5 The Functional-Communicative Features of General Interrogative Utterances

The particles *chy?* [but?], *khiba?* [really?], *nevzhe?* [really?] may not only refer to individual components, but also to whole utterances, expressing a complete modal question, "focused on what they know about the event as a whole, but do not know whether it is true. The question arises from doubts about the reality of the event and aims to determine the credibility of the information

obtained” (Vykhovanets’, 1993, p. 156). The role of the interrogative particle in such general interrogative constructions, in which we can trace a gradual increase of intonation until the end of the utterance without logical emphasis on a specific syntaxeme, is insignificant. This confirms the possibility of its extraction without loss of content. Compare: *Chy mozhna “peresichnomu slukhachevi” potrapyty na kontsert y vashoho festyvaliu?* [But is it possible for an “average listener” to get tickets to the concerts of your festival?] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 08.06.2011) and *Realno “peresichnomu slukhachevi” potrapyty na kontsert y vashoho festyvaliu?* [Is it really possible for an “average listener” to get tickets to the concerts of your festival?]; *Khiba zh brakuie knyzhok?* [Is there really the lack of books?] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 08.07.2011) and *Brakuie knyzhok?* [The lack of books?]; *Nevzhe brakuie myttsiv?* [Is there really the lack of artists?] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 02.06.2001) and *Brakuie myttsiv?* [The lack of artists?]. Of course, the absence of interrogative particles somewhat deprives the sentence of the expression of some modal nuances, including uncertainty, doubt, mistrust, hesitation, and surprise. However, the absence of interrogative particles does not diminish the main communicative purpose of the request — to determine the credibility of the information obtained. Each of the above questions, all the syntaxemes of which relate to the rheme, can be answered by an affirmative statement with an affirmative or negative predicate — “*Peresichnomu slukhachevi*” *mozhna potrapyty na kontsert y vashoho festyvaliu* [“The average listener can get tickets to the concerts of your festival”]; and “*Peresichnomu slukhachevi*” *ne mozhna potrapyty na kontsert y vashoho festyvaliu* [The average listener cannot get tickets to the concerts of your festival]; *Knyzhok brakuie* [The lack of books] and *Knyzhok ne brakuie* [Enough books]; *Myttsiv brakuie* [The lack of artists] and *Myttsiv ne brakuie* [Enough artists] — or their equivalents, the unarticulated affirmative statement *Tak* [Yes], or the unarticulated negative statement *Ni* [No].

If the speakers do not know the event in general, then their so-called complete dictal question (in the terminology of S. Balli), is not directed to part of the information, but to the entire content of the utterance (Balli, 1955, p. 47). Examples are questions such as *Shcho vidbulosia?* [What happened?], *Shcho trapylosia?* [What happened?], *Shcho stalosia* [What happened?], *U chomu rich?* [What’s the matter?], *Shcho robyv* [subject]? [What did [the subject] do?], *U yakomu stani chy protsesi perebuvaie* [subject]? [In what state or process is [the subject]?], which constitute a complex rheme, the main means of expression of which is interrogative intonation. According to the communicative task, the interlocutor can give an answer to utterances that are not articulated by theme or rheme. Instead, all components are rhemes: *Vechoriie* [It is getting dark] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 21.02.2008); *Nastala tysha* [Silence fell] (<https://day.kyiv.ua>, 22.06.2001).

## 6 Summary

The selected and analysed source base made it possible to identify some differences from the previously proposed theoretical statements. In particular, in addition to the previously stated division of interrogative constructions into those which implement full and partial dictation questions, we may talk about the existence of complete and partial modal questions. It was also found that interrogative utterances from headlines and from journalistic texts differ slightly. In headlines the intention of the request is usually partially levelled out. The communicative-pragmatic potential of such sentences, however, does not decrease. The illustrative material made it possible to identify a number of specific features of the analysed syntactic items.

Compared to the narrative sentences in headlines, the interrogative sentences are more aimed at interesting readers, encouraging them to read the article. The study of syntactic units with different functional potentials with the intention of request allows us to state that the headlines are dominated by sentences focused on obtaining new information about the subject. In accordance with the illocutionary purpose, the authors often use questions about the circumstances of events. The implementation of this function is often oriented to interrogative pronominal adverbs, which serve as a means of expressing adverbial syntaxemes, in particular time, reason, purpose,

condition, and manner. Quantitatively, they are much inferior to sentences in which the speaker formulates questions about objects, recipients and sources of information. The structures that implement questions about means of transportation, instruments and locatives are on the periphery. At the same time, the similarity of all the partial interrogative utterances is revealed in their communicative structure, which consists in the preposition of the rheme to the theme and in forming the rheme with the different partial linguistic status of interrogative words, which indicates their informational significance. This pattern is slightly broken in general interrogative constructions, where the main emphasis is on the expression of modal shades of uncertainty, doubt, mistrust, hesitation, and surprise through the use of interrogative particles.

The communicative organization of interrogative sentences is closely related to their semantic-syntactic organization. The communicative intention of the speaker's request determines the intonation type of the question (full dictal, partial dictal, full modal, partial modal), and accordingly the syntaxeme and formal structure of the interrogative sentence, and the semantic, morphological and positional variants of the interrogative marker.

Prospects for further research lie in the study of the communicative and semantic-syntactic organization of improper-interrogative sentences (rhetorical questions, interrogations, imperative questions), which are significantly close to narrative or imperative sentences.

## References

- Balli, Sh. (1955). *Obshchaia lingvistika i voprosy frantsuzskogo iazyka*. Izd-vo inostrannoï literatury.
- Dimitrova, T., & Stefanova, V. (2018). The semantic classification of adjectives in the Bulgarian Wordnet: Towards a multiclass approach. *Cognitive Studies / Études cognitives*, 2018(18), Article 1709. <https://doi.org/10.11649/cs.1709>
- Dudyk, P. S. (1999). *Iz syntaksysu prostoho rechennia: Navch. posibnyk*. VDPU im. M. Kotsiubyn's'koho.
- Dziob, A., & Piasecki, M. (2018). Dynamic verbs in the Wordnet of Polish. *Cognitive Studies / Études cognitives*, 2018(18), Article 1718. <https://doi.org/10.11649/cs.1718>
- Horodens'ka, K. H. (1991). *Deryvatsiia syntaksychnykh odynyts'*. Naukova dumka.
- Kadomtseva, L. O. (1972). Syntaksychna modal'nist' rechennia. In I. K. Bilodid (Ed.), *Suchasna ukraïns'ka literaturna mova: Syntaksys* (pp. 119–137). Naukova dumka.
- Kostusiak, N. M. (2012). *Struktura mizhrivmevykh katehoriï suchasnoï ukraïns'koï movy: Monohrafiia*. Volyns'kyi natsional'nyi universytet im. Lesi Ukraïnky.
- Matezius, V. (1967). O tak nazyvaemom aktual'nom chlenenii predlozheniia (G. V. Matveeva, Trans.). In N. A. Kondrashov (Ed.), *Prazhskii lingvisticheskii kruzhok: Sbornik statei* (pp. 239–245). Progress.
- Mezhov, O. H. (2012). *Typolohiia minimal'nykh semantyko-syntaksychnykh odynyts'*: Monohrafiia. Volyns'kyi natsional'nyi universytet im. Lesi Ukraïnky.
- Mirchenko, M. V. (2004). *Struktura syntaksychnykh katehoriï: Monohrafiia* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Rev. ed.). RVV "Ve-zha" Volyns'koho derzhavnoho universytetu im. Lesi Ukraïnky.
- Pankova, M. V. (2009). Evoliutsiia linhvistychnykh pohliadiv na pytal'ni rechennia: Semantychnyi i komunikatyvnyi aspekty. *Naukovi pratsi Chornomors'koho derzhavnoho universytetu imeni Petra Mohyly: Serii. Filolohiia. Movoznavstvo*, 105(92), 102–106.
- Pankova, M. V. (2013). Komunikatyvna budova pytal'nykh rechen'. *Linhvistychni studii*, 2013(27), 92–96.
- Pliushch, M. IA. (2016). *Katehoriia vidminka v semantyko-syntaksychnii strukturi rechennia*. Vydavnytstvo Natsional'noho pedahohichnoho universytetu im. M. P. Drahomanova.
- Shabat, S. T. (2000). *Katehoriia pytal'noi modal'nosti v suchasniï ukraïns'kii movi* [Unpublished summary of doctoral dissertation]. Prykarpats'kyi derzh. un-t im. V. Stefanyka.
- Shabat, S. T. (2001). Rechennia pytal'noi modal'nosti v suchasniï ukraïns'kii movi. *Movoznavstvo*, 2001(1), 53–58.
- Shabat-Savka, S. T. (2016). Markery aktualizatsii intentsii zapytu: Ukraïns'komovnyi pytal'nyi dyskurs. *Visnyk Mariupol's'koho derzhavnoho universytetu: Serii. Filolohiia*, 2016(14), 103–112.
- Shabat-Savka, S. T. (2019). Komunikatyvna intentsiia i deryvatsiïnyi potentsial pytal'nykh vysloven'. In N. H. Horholiuk, L. M. Kolibaba, & V. M. Fursa (Eds.), *Hramatychnyi prostir suchasnoï linhvo-ukraïnistyky: Kateryni Hryhoriïvi Horodens'kii* (pp. 265–272). Vydavnychyï dim Dmytra Buraho.



- Vintoniv, M. O. (2013). *Aktual'ne chlenuvannia rechennia i tekstu: Formal'ni ta funksiïni vyiavy: Monohrafiia*. DonNU.
- Vykhovanets', I. R. (1993). *Hramatyka ukraïns'koï movy: Syntaksys*. Lybid'.
- Zahnitko, A. P. (2001). *Teoretychna hramatyka ukraïns'koï movy: Syntaksys*. DonNU.


---

The publication was financed at the authors' expense.

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

All the authors participated equally in preparing conception and academic editing of this article.

 This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 PL License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/pl/>), which permits redistribution, commercial and non-commercial, provided that the article is properly cited.

© The Authors 2021

Publisher: Institute of Slavic Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences

Publishing history: Received 2021-01-01; Accepted 2021-04-23; Published 2021-10-11.